January Bonus Quiz

As a follow-up to the recent "Quiz Yourself" installment about approving minutes (or not!), how does a chair handle a request for a correction to the written draft of a set of minutes? Would such a correction be in the form of a "friendly amendment?" Is there really such a thing as a "friendly amendment?"

The answer from Robert’s Rules of Order Newly Revised 11th edition:

(p. 162, ll. 15-19) "Regardless of whether or not the maker of the main motion 'accepts' the [friendly] amendment, it must be opened to debate and voted on formally (unless adopted by unanimous consent) and is handled under the same rules as amendments generally."

Below are additional questions to challenge yourself or others in your unit or study group:

- Were you aware that the term "friendly amendment" did not appear in RONR up through the 9th edition, but was included in RONR only beginning in the 10th edition (2000) and specifically define therein? Check out p. 162, ll. 9-15 of the (2011) 11th edition - prior to the above-quoted section - for this clear definition and explanation.
- Can you see how a proposed correction to the minutes might be considered a "friendly amendment" to correct an obvious error?
- The term also appears in In Brief on p. 116, Question 8, and continues onto p. 117. It clearly explains how an amendment (or correction to minutes) can be uncontroversial and adopted without objection. Does this then make it "friendly?"
- What if the secretary doesn't "accept" the correction in the form of an amendment? Is there such a thing as an "unfriendly" amendment?
- How would this proposed correction then be handled when there is an objection? Check the RONR citation above.

As a sidelight:

- Do you belong to any group (or consult for any organization) that likes to use the term "friendly amendment?"
- What do you do when they use it? Ignore the use of the term? Correct it? Explain it? Prohibit its use?
- Do you encourage using "unanimous consent" as a way of handling a supposedly "friendly amendment?"